



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

09/586,722

06/05/2000

Robert I. McLean

350725-991110

7897

26379 7590 01/30/2009  
DLA PIPER LLP (US )  
2000 UNIVERSITY AVENUE  
EAST PALO ALTO, CA 94303-2248

EXAMINER

BOSWELL, BETH V

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

3623

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

01/30/2009

PAPER

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

1 UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

2  
3  
4 BEFORE THE BOARD OF PATENT APPEALS  
5 AND INTERFERENCES  
6

7  
8 *Ex parte* ROBERT I. G. MCLEAN and RODNEY J. ANDERSON  
9

10  
11 Appeal 2008-1848  
12 Application 09/586,722  
13 Technology Center 3600  
14

15  
16 Decided: January 30, 2009  
17

18  
19 *Before* MURRIEL E. CRAWFORD, JOSEPH A. FISCHETTI and BIBHU  
20 R. MOHANTY, *Administrative Patent Judges*.

21  
22 CRAWFORD, *Administrative Patent Judge*.  
23

24  
25 DECISION ON APPEAL  
26

27 STATEMENT OF THE CASE

28 Appellants appeal under 35 U.S.C. § 134 (2002) from a final rejection  
29 of claims 1-5, 8-18 and 21-22. We have jurisdiction under 35 U.S.C. § 6(b)  
30 (2002).

1 Appellants invented a data processing system and method for  
2 assessing the value creation of a business enterprise (Specification 1:10-11).

3 Independent claim 1 under appeal read as follows:

4 1. A computer-implemented method of  
5 processing data relating to the performance of a  
6 business enterprise in creating value, comprising:  
7 developing a data structure, by use of a  
8 computer system, including assumed variables that  
9 have a influence on a value stream of the business  
10 enterprise, the assumed variables in said data  
11 structure being arranged in a multi-level hierarchy  
12 in which assumed variables positioned at a lower  
13 level in the hierarchy influence one or more  
14 assumed variables positioned at a higher level in  
15 the hierarchy;  
16 determining, by use of a computer system, a  
17 first outcome for the value stream of the business  
18 enterprise based upon the assumed variables;  
19 authorizing a user to alter one or more of the  
20 assumed variables based on a level of  
21 authorization of the user and a level of the  
22 hierarchy in which the assumed variables are  
23 positioned, wherein different levels of  
24 authorization have access to different levels of  
25 assumed variables; and  
26 determining a second outcome for the value  
27 stream of the business enterprise taking into  
28 account the altered assumed variables.

29  
30 The prior art relied upon by the Examiner in rejecting the claims on  
31 appeal is:

32 Eder	US 6,321,205 B1	Nov. 20, 2001
33 Belani et al.	US 6,944,777 B1	Sep. 13, 2005

34  
35 The Examiner rejected claims 1-5, 8-18 and 21-22 under 35 U.S.C.  
36 § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Eder in view of Belani.

1           We AFFIRM.

2

3

## ISSUES

4 Did the Appellants show the Examiner erred in failing to withdraw  
5 rejections based on Eder in view of the withdrawal of rejections based on  
6 Eder in a related application?

7 Did the Appellants show the Examiner erred in rejecting claims in  
8 view of Eder because Eder is non-analogous art?

9 Did the Appellants show the Examiner erred in finding that Eder  
10 discloses determining an outcome for a value stream as recited in claims 1,  
11 5, 10, 14 and 18?

12 Did the Appellants show the Examiner erred in finding that Eder  
13 discloses “determining, by use of the computer system, an outcome for the  
14 value stream of the business enterprise based upon the assumed variables  
15 and events of the base case scenario” as recited in claim 18?

16 Did the Appellants show the Examiner erred by finding that a  
17 combination of Eder and Belani fails to render obvious “authorizing” a user  
18 to “alter one or more assumed variables based on a level of authorization of  
19 the user and a level of the hierarchy in which the assumed variables are  
20 positioned, wherein different levels of authorization have access to different  
21 levels of assumed variables” as recited in claims 1, 5, 14 and 18?

22 Did the Appellants show the Examiner erred by failing to provide  
23 proper motivations for combining Eder and Belani?

24 Did the Appellants show the Examiner erred by finding that a  
25 combination of Eder and Belani fails to render obvious “selectively

1 authorizing a plurality of users to provide real-time feedback on the value  
2 creation performance of the business enterprise based on a level of  
3 authorization of each user, wherein only certain levels of authorization are  
4 permitted to provide real-time feedback” as recited in claim 10?

5

6

## FINDINGS OF FACT

7

### *Specification*

8

Appellants invented a data processing system and method for  
9 assessing the value creation of a business enterprise (Specification 1:10-11).

10

Traditional accounting methods for assessing the value creation of a  
11 business enterprise are inadequate because “[i]n today’s world, however, the  
12 most important assets of many enterprises are not plant and equipment but  
13 rather knowledge, ideas, and skills. For the most part, knowledge-based  
14 assets are not acquired through third-party transactions, but are rather  
15 developed in-house. As such, they are not adequately capturing using  
16 traditional accounting methods” (Specification 1:19-22).

17

“Data that is relevant to performance of a business enterprise may be  
18 maintained in the database 104 (Figure 1). As used herein, ‘business  
19 enterprise’ is intended to encompass for profit, not-for-profit and  
20 governmental organizations. The database 104 may be in form of a  
21 relational database. Input and output from the database 104 may be in the  
22 context of one of four different ‘perspectives’ into the data (e.g., each  
23 perspective may be an organization or arrangement of data). These  
24 perspectives may include: a perspective that reflects the company’s strategy  
25 for creating and realizing value, referred to herein as value creation and

1 realization formula; a value stream model perspective; a value creation  
2 capacity perspective; and a value creation for multiple stakeholders  
3 perspective” (Specification 8:11-19).

4 “The value stream model perspective... may include... assumptions  
5 regarding future events” (Specification 8:29-9:3).

6 “[A] ‘value stream’ for a business enterprise is an aggregation of  
7 financial and non-financial benefits flowing to the business and arising from  
8 a minimum set of activities that are necessary to give rise to the benefits.”

9 ... “[A] non-financial benefit may be enhanced customer loyalty.”

10 (Specification 9:4-12).

11 “Events and assumed variables are organized in several data  
12 structures. Events and assumed variables related to financial value creation  
13 outcomes are organized in the event/assumption matrix, as described  
14 above.”... “All assumed variables that have an influence on a future  
15 financial or non-financial value stream of the business enterprise are linked  
16 to at least one future or past event for each assumed variable that influences  
17 the corresponding assumed variable” (Specification 25:1-7).

18  
19 *Eder*

20 Eder discloses “a computer based method of and system for  
21 evaluating the probable impact of user-specified or system generated  
22 changes in business value drivers on the other value drivers, the financial  
23 performance and the future value of a commercial enterprise” (col. 1, ll. 18-  
24 22).

1 A new system is necessary because “[a]ccounting systems are ‘wrong’  
2 for one simple reason, they track tangible assets while ignoring intangible  
3 assets. Intangible assets such as the skills of the workers, intellectual  
4 property, business infrastructure, databases, and relationships with  
5 customers and suppliers are not measured with current accounting systems”  
6 (col. 1, ll. 30-36).

7 The enterprise business value may include both tangible and  
8 intangible elements (col. 6, ll. 43-46). The value of an enterprise operation  
9 is the sum of (1) a current value of excess cash and marketable securities, (2)  
10 value of current-operation and (3) value of growth options (col. 6, Table 2).  
11 Current operation values may include financial assets (e.g., accounts  
12 receivable, inventory, prepaid expenses) and value generating assets  
13 (brandnames, customer base, employees, strategic alliances, vendors,  
14 general going concern value) (Fig. 14). Current operation value may also  
15 include the sum of (1) value of expected revenue, (2) value of expected  
16 expenses and (3) value of capital (Table 3). The value of capital can have a  
17 positive or negative value (Table 3).

18 Information such as accounts receivable, accounts payable, capital  
19 asset, inventory, invoicing, payroll and purchasing subsystems are stored on  
20 worksheets, files, tables and databases of general-ledger accounting systems  
21 (col. 12, ll. 53-60). “[T]hese databases, tables and files are accessed by the  
22 application software of the present invention as required to extract the  
23 information required for completing a business valuation” (col. 12, ll. 60-  
24 63). “The general ledger system generally maintains summary, dollar only  
25 transaction histories and balances for all accounts, while the associated

1 subsystems, accounts payable, accounts receivable, inventory, invoicing,  
2 payroll and purchasing, maintain more detailed historical transaction data  
3 and balances for their respective accounts. It is common practice for each  
4 subsystem to maintain the detailed information shown in Table 6 for each  
5 transaction” (col. 13, ll. 24-31). For example, an account receivable  
6 transaction may include customer, transaction date, product sold, quantity,  
7 price, amount due, terms, due date and account number (col. 12, Table 6).  
8 In another example, an inventory transaction may include item number,  
9 transaction date, transaction type, transaction quantity, location and account  
10 number” (col. 12, Table 6).

11 The next step in system processing is completed by software block  
12 221 where the software in the block prompts the user (20) via an element of  
13 value specification data window (907) to define the elements of value for  
14 each enterprise, to indicate the maximum number of sub-elements for each  
15 element and to identify the identity and location of transaction data and other  
16 information that are related to each element of value (col. 21, ll. 1-9).

17 The information entered by the user (20) defining the elements of  
18 value is stored in the element of value definition table (153), the location of  
19 the element of value data is stored in the composite variable location table  
20 (167), and an index of the element of value data is stored in the composite  
21 variable data table (168) in the application database (50), before processing  
22 advances to a software block 222 (col. 21, ll. 34-39).

23  
24 *Belani*



1 Belani discloses “techniques for controlling access to resources in a  
2 multi-domain distributed computing environment” (col. 1, ll. 60-63).

3 “Distributed computer networks allow efficient sharing of resources  
4 among users of the distributed system in a seamless manner. Examples of  
5 resources that may be shared include information resources such as  
6 databases, files, etc., or operation resources such as devices or processes”  
7 (col. 2, ll. 13-18).

8 “The access controller is configured to receive a request from a  
9 particular user requesting performance of one or more operations on a  
10 particular resource. The access controller attempts to resolve permissions  
11 for the operations in the request based on access list information for the  
12 particular resource and user hierarchy information for the requesting user”  
13 (col. 3, ll. 2-8).

14 “According to another embodiment of the present invention, the  
15 access controller attempts to resolve the requested operations based on the  
16 resource hierarchy information and access list information for the resources  
17 in the resource hierarchy information. If all the operations in the user’s  
18 request cannot be resolved based on the resource hierarchy information and  
19 the access list information for the resources in the resource hierarchy  
20 information, the access controller then attempts to resolve the unresolved  
21 operations based on the resource hierarchy information in combination with  
22 the particular user’s hierarchy information, and the access list information  
23 for the resources in the resource hierarchy information” (col. 3, ll. 44-56).

“The increased deployment of resources via distributed networks has led to a heightened awareness of security concerns regarding the need to protect resources from unauthorized access” (col. 2, ll. 19-22).

“[C]onventional access control systems do not provide the desired ease of use, access control granularity, and scalability in a distributed environment. As a result, many of these systems are difficult to use and administer and do not scale well as the number of resources, requests, and users increase[s]. Thus, there is a need for an access control system which can efficiently control access to resources in a distributed environment. It is desired that the system be easy to use and administer, provide fine grained access control granularity, and be easily scalable as the number of principals and resources increase[s]” (col. 2, ll. 49-61).

# PRINCIPLES OF LAW

Examiners are not bound to follow other examiners' interpretations. *Dayco Products Inc. v. Total Containment Inc.*, 329 F.3d 1358, 1368 (Fed. Cir. 2003).

A reference is analogous art if it is either in the field of the applicant's endeavor or reasonably pertinent to the particular problem with which the inventor was concerned. *In re Oetiker*, 977 F.2d 1443, 1447 (Fed. Cir. 1992). In addition, when a work is available in one field of endeavor, design incentives and other market forces can prompt variations of it, either in the same field or a different one. For the same reason, if a technique has been used to improve one device, and a person of ordinary skill in the art would recognize that it would improve similar devices in the same way, using the

1 technique is obvious unless its actual application is beyond his or her skill.

2 *KSR Int'l Co. v. Teleflex Inc.*, 127 S. Ct. 1727, 1740 (2007).

3 A combination of familiar elements according to known methods is  
4 likely to be obvious when it does no more than yield predictable results.

5 *KSR Int'l Co.*, 127 S. Ct. at 1731.

6 During examination, claims are to be given their broadest reasonable  
7 interpretation consistent with the specification, and claim language should  
8 be read in light of the specification as it would be interpreted by one of  
9 ordinary skill in the art. *In re Am. Acad. of Sci. Tech Ctr.*, 367 F.3d 1359,  
10 1369 (Fed. Cir. 2004).

11 In examining the specification for proper context, however,  
12 limitations from the specification will not be imported into the claims.  
13 *CollegeNet, Inc. v. ApplyYourself, Inc.*, 418 F.3d 1225, 1231 (Fed. Cir.  
14 2005) (citing *Teleflex, Inc. v. Ficoso N. Am. Corp.*, 299 F.3d 1313, 1326  
15 (Fed. Cir. 2002)).

16 The test for obviousness is not whether the features of a secondary  
17 reference may be bodily incorporated into the structure of the primary  
18 reference; nor is it that the claimed invention must be expressly suggested in  
19 any one or all of the references. Rather, the test is what the combined  
20 teachings of the references would have suggested to those of ordinary skill  
21 in the art. *In re Keller*, 642 F.2d 413, 425 (CCPA 1981).

22  
23 ANALYSIS

24 *Related Application*

1           This application is a continuation-in-part application of U.S. Patent  
2   Application No. 09/574,569 (“’569 application”). Appellants assert that  
3   because the Examiner withdrew a rejection based on Eder in the ‘569  
4   application, that the rejection based on Eder should be withdrawn in this  
5   application as well (Appeal Brief 4-5; Reply Brief 8). Whether or not the  
6   applications are related, Examiner’s are not bound by the interpretations and  
7   subsequent actions of other Examiners. *See Dayco Products Inc. v. Total*  
8   *Containment Inc.*, 329 F.3d at 1368.

9           Moreover, the claims of the ‘569 application are not the same as those  
10   in the present application (Examiner’s Answer 7). The manner in which the  
11   claims differ is important because several of the aspects set forth in the  
12   Appeal Brief at pages 4-5 as allegedly not being disclosed by Eder, such as  
13   “future financial value streams,” “analyzing individual value streams,” and  
14   “determining the present value of future value streams,” are not set forth in  
15   claims of the present application. Accordingly, the alleged persuasiveness  
16   of the arguments in the ‘569 application with respect to Eder concerning  
17   these aspects are not applicable to the present claims.

18  
19   *Non-Analogous Art*

20           In asserting that Eder and the present invention solve different  
21   problems and do so using different methods, the Appellants appear to be  
22   asserting that Eder and the present application are non-analogous art (Appeal  
23   Brief 5-6). A reference is properly used in a rejection, if the reference is  
24   either (1) in the field of the applicant's endeavor or, if not, (2) reasonably  
25   pertinent to the particular problem with which the inventor was concerned.

1 *In re Oetiker*, 977 F.2d at 1447. The Supreme Court has expanded this test  
2 to merely require that the reference be reasonably pertinent to *any* problem  
3 solved either explicitly or implicitly by the present application, regardless of  
4 the inventor's subjective intentions. *See KSR Int'l Co.*, 127 S. Ct. at 1740.

5 Appellants admit that both Eder and the present invention use certain  
6 financial techniques to calculate business value (Appeal Brief 5).  
7 Accordingly, because Eder and the present invention are in the same field,  
8 the first prong of the *In re Oetiker* test is met.

9 Furthermore, even if Eder was not in the exact field of Appellants'  
10 endeavor, both the present application and Eder specifically address the  
11 problem that current business valuation methods do not properly account for  
12 intangible assets (Specification 1:19-22; Eder, col. 1, ll. 30-36). Appellants  
13 take a much too narrow approach by requiring that the problems and  
14 solutions in Eder and the application be essentially identical. As long as the  
15 cited art is reasonably pertinent to *any* problem explicitly or implicitly  
16 solved by the present application, as Eder clearly is here, the second prong  
17 of the test set forth in *In re Oetiker* is also satisfied.

18  
19 *Determining an Outcome for a Value Stream*

20 Appellants assert that Eder does not disclose determining an outcome  
21 of a value stream. Appellants also assert that the Specification at p. 9, ll. 4-6  
22 imparts the following definition to "value stream": an aggregation of  
23 financial and non-financial benefits flowing to the business and arising from  
24 a minimum set of activities that are necessary to give rise to the benefits  
25 (Appeal Brief 7; Reply Brief 6-7). Whether or not this definition for value

1 stream is correct, Eder discloses determining an outcome of a value stream  
2 even under Appellants' definition.

3 Eder discloses that an enterprise business value may include both  
4 tangible and intangible elements. Some of these elements include excess  
5 cash, marketable securities, accounts receivable, inventory, prepaid  
6 expenses, brandnames, customer base, employees, strategic alliances, and  
7 vendors. Under a broadest reasonable interpretation, at least some of these  
8 elements are financial and non-financial benefits that allegedly make up a  
9 value stream determination. *See In re Am. Acad. of Sci. Tech Ctr.*, 367 F.3d  
10 at 1369.

11 Appellants also assert that Eder only considers past and current  
12 valuations while the present invention considers future valuations (Reply  
13 Brief 6). However, no such limitation is set forth in the claims, and thus will  
14 not be considered. *See CollegeNet, Inc.*, 418 F.3d at 1231.

15  
16 *Assumed Variables and Events*

17 Appellants assert that Eder does not disclose assumed variables tied to  
18 events (Appeal Brief 8; Reply Brief 7-8). While Appellants do not provide  
19 explicit support from either the claims or the Specification that assumed  
20 variables must be tied to events, even assuming that it is correct, Eder  
21 discloses assumed variables tied to events.

22 Eder discloses that items such as accounts receivable and inventory  
23 are taken into consideration when determining the enterprise business value.  
24 Eder also discloses that the following fields for individual accounts  
25 receivable transactions may be maintained in databases, tables and files for

1 use in determining the enterprise business value: customer, transaction date,  
2 product sold, quantity, price, amount due, terms, due date and account  
3 number. For an inventory transaction, the fields may include item number,  
4 transaction date, transaction type, transaction quantity, location and account  
5 number. Under a broadest reasonable interpretation, at least some of these  
6 fields are tied to individual events that are later converted into quantified  
7 values for determining the enterprise business value. *See In re Am. Acad. of*  
8 *Sci. Tech Ctr.*, 367 F.3d at 1369.

9  
10 *Authorization Hierarchy*

11 Appellants assert that a combination of Belani and Eder does not  
12 render obvious “authorizing” a user to “alter one or more assumed variables  
13 based on a level of authorization of the user and a level of the hierarchy in  
14 which the assumed variables are positioned, wherein different levels of  
15 authorization have access to different levels of assumed variables” as recited  
16 in claims 1, 5, 14 and 18. Specifically, the Appellants assert that while  
17 Belani may disclose controlling individual user access to individual  
18 databases, files and other storage means, Belani does not disclose controlling  
19 individual user access to individual variables within the databases and files  
20 (Appeal Brief 9; Reply Brief 1-2).

21 However, Eder discloses users having access to specific data locations  
22 tied to elements of value (col. 21, ll. 1-9, 34-39). Accordingly, by definition,  
23 a user (20) has a sufficient level of authorization down to the individual data  
24 level to enter the element of value data prompted by element of value  
25 specification data window (907).

1           Moreover, Belani discloses controlling access to resources where  
2 resources is defined as “databases, files, etc., or operation resources such as  
3 devices or processes.” In setting forth this definition of resources to include  
4 “etc.,” Belani encompasses all aspects of a database hierarchy, including  
5 data.

6           Furthermore, the Appellants argue that the difference between  
7 granting access to databases as opposed to data “is significant because  
8 access control for individual units of data in a database increases in  
9 complexity as the amount of data in the database increases” (Appeal Brief  
10 10; Reply Brief 2). However, Belani discloses that their invention addresses  
11 this problem as well at col. 2, ll. 48-61, specifically citing access control  
12 granularity and scalability. In the context of a database hierarchy, the  
13 individual data variable would be the epitome of fine grained access control  
14 granularity.

15  
16 *Motivation for Combining Eder and Belani*

17           Appellants assert that there is no motivation for combining Eder and  
18 Belani as set forth by the Examiner because the “combination would  
19 produce a system that is non-operative and fatally flawed” (Appeal Brief 13;  
20 Reply Brief 4). “However, the test for obviousness is not whether the  
21 features of a secondary reference may be bodily incorporated into the  
22 structure of the primary reference; nor is it that the claimed invention must  
23 be expressly suggested in any one or all of the references. Rather, the test is  
24 what the combined teachings of the references would have suggested to



1 those of ordinary skill in the art.” *In re Keller*, 642 F.2d 413, 425 (CCPA  
2 1981).

3 Eder discloses “a computer based method of and system for  
4 evaluating the probable impact of user-specified or system generated  
5 changes in business value drivers on the other value drivers, the financial  
6 performance and the future value of a commercial enterprise” (col. 1, ll. 18-  
7 22). Belani discloses “techniques for controlling access to resources in a  
8 multi-domain distributed computing environment” (col. 1, ll. 60-63). Page 5  
9 of the Examiner’s Answer asserts that “at the time of the invention, it would  
10 have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art for the system of  
11 Eder to incorporate access control of its variables in its data processing  
12 system by granting authorization levels to each user for each assumed  
13 variable as taught by Belani et al. because doing so ensures that only users  
14 with the proper permission have access to the variables, thus maintaining the  
15 integrity of the data within the system.” This motivation to combine is  
16 facially reasonable and sufficient under *KSR Int’l Co.*, 127 S. Ct. at 1731,  
17 1740, and the Appellants have failed to specifically address why the  
18 proffered rationale is flawed.

19 As for the alleged technical incompatibility of the systems Eder and  
20 Belani, not only is this irrelevant under *In re Keller*, but Belani discloses  
21 protocols for resolving hierarchical conflicts (col. 3, ll. 44-56). Accordingly,  
22 one of ordinary skill familiar with both Eder and Belani would have been  
23 able to resolve the alleged technical incompatibilities in the combination  
24 should they have arisen.

1    *Real-Time Feedback*

2           For the same reasons that Appellants alleged that the combination of  
3   Eder and Belani does not render obvious “authorizing a user to alter one or  
4   more assumed variables,” the Appellants assert that the combination of Eder  
5   and Belani also does not render obvious “authorizing a plurality of users to  
6   provide real-time feedback” as recited in claim 10. “[A]uthorizing a user to  
7   alter one or more assumed variables” has been found obvious. Moreover,  
8   altering an element of value in Eder results in the “real-time feedback” of  
9   changes in other values used in calculating a business value. Accordingly,  
10   “authorizing a plurality of users to provide real-time feedback” is also  
11   obvious in view of Eder and Belani.

12

13                                   CONCLUSIONS OF LAW

14           The Appellants did not show that the Examiner erred in failing to  
15   withdraw rejections based on Eder in view of the withdrawal of rejections  
16   based on Eder in a related application.

17           The Appellants did not show that the Examiner erred in rejecting  
18   claims in view Eder because Eder is non-analogous art.

19           The Appellants did not show that the Examiner erred in finding that  
20   Eder discloses determining an outcome for a value stream as recited in  
21   claims 1, 5, 10, 14 and 18.

22           The Appellants did not show that the Examiner erred in finding that  
23   Eder discloses “determining, by use of the computer system, an outcome for  
24   the value stream of the business enterprise based upon the assumed variables  
25   and events of the base case scenario” as recited in claim 18.

The Appellants did not show that the Examiner erred by finding that a combination of Eder and Belani fails to render obvious “authorizing” a user to “alter one or more assumed variables based on a level of authorization of the user and a level of the hierarchy in which the assumed variables are positioned, wherein different levels of authorization have access to different levels of assumed variables” as recited in claims 1, 5, 14 and 18.

The Appellants did not show that the Examiner erred by failing to provide proper motivations for combining Eder and Belani.

The Appellants did not show that the Examiner erred by finding that a combination of Eder and Belani fails to render obvious “selectively authorizing a plurality of users to provide real-time feedback on the value creation performance of the business enterprise based on a level of authorization of each user, wherein only certain levels of authorization are permitted to provide real-time feedback” as recited in claim 10.

The Appellants have failed to show that the Examiner erred in rejecting claims 1-5, 8-18 and 21-22 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Eder in view of Belani.

## DECISION

The decision of the Examiner to reject claims 1-3, 9-13, and 19-24 is affirmed.

AFFIRMED

Appeal 2008-1848  
Application 09/586,722

1 JRG  
2  
3 DLA PIPER LLP (US)  
4 2000 UNIVERSITY AVENUE  
5 EAST PALO ALTO, CA 94303-2248